

REMARKS

Applicants amended all claims, except claims 4, 14, and 24 to change the claim term “file format” to “image file format” and renamed the “first computing system” to the “facsimile server” and the “second computing system” to “conversion computer”. Applicants made these amendments to clarify the claim terms. Applicants made further amendments discussed below.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected the pre-amended form of claims 1-13, 15-23, and 25-30 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102) by Szurkowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,933). Applicant traverses these rejections with respect to the amended claims for the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 recite a method, system, and signal bearing medium for processing a message in a network computing system including a facsimile transmission comprised of a recipient contact address and message content, wherein the message content includes at least one of message text and attached files. These claims require: managing with the facsimile server the facsimile transmissions as fax jobs; transferring with the facsimile server the message content to a conversion computer; maintaining, with the conversion computer, multiple application programs to convert the content of different attachment files to images in the file format, wherein a plurality of the application programs are capable of converting files in different formats to an image file format; launching, with the conversion computer, at least one application program to convert the message content to converted message in the image file format; transferring, with the conversion computer, the converted message content to the facsimile server; and transferring, with the facsimile server, the converted message content in the image file format to a communication port for transmittal to the recipient contact address.

Applicants submit that the amended claims 1, 11, and 21 distinguish over the sections of Szurkowski cited in the Final Office Action.

The Examiner cited FIG. 1 and col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 19 as teaching the above claim requirements. (Final Office Action, pgs. 1-2) The Examiner cited components 101-1, 101-2, and 102-1 as the disclosing the claimed first computing system, which is now the facsimile server. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) The claims require that the facsimile server manage the fax job and transfer the message content of the fax job to a conversion computer to use one of multiple application programs capable of converting files in different formats to an image file

format. The cited components 101-1, 101-2 comprise standard telephone equipment that participates in a teleconference and the cited components 102-1 comprises a fax machine of an attendee of the teleconference. (Col. 3, lines 1-10). Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that these standard telephone components perform the claim requirements of managing a facsimile transmission as a fax job and transmitting the message content of managed fax jobs to a conversion computer to launch programs to convert the message content. Further, the cited Szurkowski nowhere discloses that the cited telephone equipment receive the converted message content and forward to the recipient address. Thus, the cited components 101-1, 101-2, and 102-1 do not operate as the claimed facsimile server.

The Examiner found that the Administrative processor 110 in FIG. 1 of Szurkowski discloses the claimed second computer system, now the conversion computer. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) The amended claims 1, 11, and 21 now require that the conversion computer receive message content for a fax job and launch application programs to convert the message content to an image file format. The cited cols. 2-4 of Szurkowski mention that an administrative processor 110 informs a voice bridge of teleconference schedules and creates an attendance table for each teleconference. Other functions of the administrative processor 110 include handling billing, running reports, and performing diagnostics in the server 103. (Szurkowski, col. 3, line 13-col. 4, line 4) Nowhere do the cited cols. 2-4 anywhere disclose that the administrative processor 110, which the Examiner likens to the claimed second computing system, now the conversion computer, perform the claimed operations of receiving message content from a facsimile server, maintaining multiple application programs to convert attachment files in different formats to an image file format, and launching at least one application to convert the message content to converted message content in the image file format.

The Examiner further cited col. 4, lines 21-25 of Szurkowski as disclosing the claim requirement of converting the message content to at least one image in a file format and transferring, with the second computing system, the converted message content in the file format to the first computing system. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) Applicant traverses.

The cited col. 4 mentions that an email processor 139 processes files from an email message and feeds the files to a software application to convert their content to facsimile pages. (Applicants note that the Examiner is now citing the email processor 139 for the claimed second

computing system, even though the Examiner previously cited administrative server 110 as the claimed second computing system.) Although the cited col. 4 mentions how to convert email content to facsimile pages, nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose the added claim requirement that the conversion computer have a plurality of application programs for converting files in different formats to a single image file format. Instead, the cited Szurkowski mentions that the cited email processor 139 stores the converted pages in a facsimile bridge 150, where the facsimile bridge 150 transmits the fax. (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 30-40 and FIG. 1). Thus, the cited Szurkowski does not disclose that the fax job management and transmission are performed in a facsimile server and the conversion in a conversion computer as claimed because the cited Szurkowski has all these operations performed by a single component, the email processor.

In the Advisory Action dated September 25, 2003, the Examiner further found that all these operations are performed by just the email processor. Thus, the cited email processor 139, which the Examiner cites for the operations of the claimed second computing system, now the conversion computer, does not transfer the message content to a facsimile server as claimed because the email processor 139 and facsimile bridge 150 are in the same computing system, the teleconferencing server 103, not separate computers as claimed.

Further, nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that the email processor 139 maintain multiple application programs to convert files in different formats to the image file format.

Further, the claims require that the facsimile server that manages the facsimile transmission and transfers the fax to a communication port also transmit the message content to a conversion computer that uses multiple application programs to convert the content of different attachment files in different file formats to converted content in the image file format. However, the cited email processor 139, which was cited for the requirements of the claimed second computing system, now the conversion computer, receives the email content from an email network 161 (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 21-25), and not from a separate facsimile server that manages the facsimile transmission and transfers the converted message content to a communication port for transmittal as claimed. In other words, the cited email network 161, which provides the email processor 139 of Szurkowski a fax to convert, does not manage the

facsimile transmission and transfer the message to a communication port as claimed. Thus, the cited email processor 139 does not disclose the claimed conversion computer that maintains and launches applications to convert the message content because the cited email processor 139 does not perform the claimed operations of receiving the message content from a facsimile server that also manages the facsimile transmission and transfers the converted message content.

The Examiner cited col. 4, line 56 to col. 6, line 53 and col. 8, lines 9-65 as disclosing the operation of transferring, with the first computing system, the message content to a communication port. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) The cited cols. 4-6 discuss the facsimile bridge 150 in the server 103 that transmits fax jobs converted by the email processor 139. However, the claims require that the facsimile server transfer the message content to the conversion computer to use one of a plurality of application programs to convert the message content. The cited facsimile bridge 150 that transmits the fax does not perform the claimed operations of the facsimile server of managing the facsimile transmission as a fax job and transferring message content to a conversion computer that converts the content.

Thus, the cited Szurkowski fails to disclose all the claim requirements because the cited Szurkowski has a single computing system, i.e., server 103, that performs all fax management and conversion operations. Further, nowhere does Szurkowski anywhere disclose the claim requirement of maintaining multiple application programs in a conversion computer to convert the content of different attachment files in different file formats to images in an image file format. Independent claims 1, 11, and 21, on the other hand, divide these operations between separate computers. The cited Szurkowski nowhere discloses that the management and transmission of a fax job is performed by a facsimile server and that a conversion computer maintains multiple application programs to attached files in different file formats and launches at least one application program to convert the message content to converted message content in an image file format that is then transferred back to the facsimile server to transfer to a communication port.

Accordingly, claims 1, 11, and 21 are patentable over the cited Szurkowski because the cited Szurkowski does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Amended claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 22, 23, 25-30 are patentable over the cited Szurkowski because they depend from one of claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the

cited Szurkowski for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, certain of the dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

Amended claims 2, 12, and 22 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require transferring, with the facsimile server, a job number assigned to the fax job to the conversion computer and requesting, with the conversion computer, the message content for the job number, wherein the facsimile server transfers the message content in response to receiving the request from the second computing system. The Examiner cited col. 5, line 16 to col. 7, line 52 as disclosing the requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) Applicant traverses.

The Examiner cited the email processor 139 as performing the operations of the second computing system, now the conversion computer, that converts the message content. The cited Szurkowski mentions that the email processor 139 receives messages having fax content from an email network 161. (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 21-24). Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose or mention that the email processor receive a job number assigned to a fax from the facsimile server that also manages the fax job. Instead, the email processor 139 in the cited Szurkowski that converts the message content receives the message from an email network 161.

Further, nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose the claim requirement of requesting, with the conversion computer, the message content for the job number. Again, the Examiner cited the email processor 139 of Szurkowski as performing the operations of the facsimile server. However, the cited Szurkowski only mentions that the email processor receives messages to fax from an email network 161. Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that the cited email processor 139 use a job number received from the same facsimile server that manages fax jobs to request the message content. Instead, in the cited Szurkowski, the email processor 139 just receives the message content from an email network 161.

The cited cols. 5-7 also nowhere disclose the above claim requirements. The cited cols. 5-7 discuss how a teleconference is managed and how the facsimile bridge 150 is used to fax materials to the teleconference attendees. Nowhere do these cited cols. 5-7 anywhere disclose the claim requirements concerning how a facsimile server that manages fax jobs transmits a job number to the conversion computer that launches applications to convert message content that the conversion computer requests using the job number. If the Examiner maintains the rejection,

Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific components from the cited Szurkowski that perform the claimed operations of the facsimile server and conversion computer.

Further, during a previous phone interview, the Examiner referenced the access code discussed in col. 6, line 17 of Szurkowski as disclosing the fax job number of claims 2, 12, and 22. Applicants traverse.

The cited access code is used to verify an attendee for access to a scheduled teleconference. This code identifies the attendee and verifies the attendee as a legitimate participant. (Col. 6, lines 17-25) Nowhere does the Szurkowski anywhere disclose that the cited access code is used by a computing system that converts fax content to request message content to convert. Instead, the access code the Examiner referenced during the phone interview is used to authenticate user access to a teleconference, not to convert attached files in different file formats to an image file format as claimed.

In the Response to Arguments of the Final Office Action, the Examiner further cited the fax numbers discussed in col. 5, lines 3-63 as disclosing the claimed fax job number used to access message content to convert. (Final Office Action, pg. 5)

Applicants traverse because the fax numbers discussed in the cited col. 5 are numbers used to fax presentation materials to teleconference attendees. Nowhere does the cited col. 5 anywhere disclose the claimed job number for a fax that is used by a conversion computer to request message content to convert.

Accordingly, amended claims 2, 12, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amended claims 3, 13, and 23 depend from claims 2, 12, and 22 and further require maintaining, with the first computing system, a job table including fax job records identified by job number and changing, with first computing system, state fields in the fax job records to manage the workflow of the fax jobs between the first computing system, second computing systems, and communication port. The Examiner cited FIG. 2 and col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 63 of Szurkowski as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg 2)

The cited Szurkowski mentions that the email processor 139 converts the message to fax pages. Nowhere does the cited Szurkowski anywhere disclose that a facsimile server, separate

from the email processor 139 (that the Examiner likens to the conversion computer) maintains a job table including job table records and changes states in such records to manage the workflow of fax jobs between the first and second computer systems. Instead, the cited Szurkowski only mentions that the email processor 139 perform conversion operations, and nowhere discloses a different computing system as managing fax jobs with a job table that are converted by the email processor 139.

The cited col. 5 discusses how the teleconferencing server 103 manages faxes sent among attendees of a teleconference. However, nowhere does the cited col. 5 anywhere disclose that a facsimile server maintain a job table having information on fax jobs to convert and transmit and that a conversion computer convert message content to fax pages as claimed.

Accordingly, claims 3, 13, and 23 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 6, 16, and 26 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21 and further require that for each attachment file received from the facsimile server, the conversion computer further performs determining one of multiple application programs capable of opening the attachment file and using the determined application program to convert the content of the attachment file to one or more images in the file format, wherein all the images in the image file format comprising the at least one converted attachment file are transferred to the first computing system. The Examiner cited col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 63 and col. 8, lines 9-65 of Szurkowski as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office action, pg. 3) Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

The cited col. 4 of Szurkowski mentions that the email processor 139 feeds files from a message to a software application to convert the content to facsimile pages. (Szurkowski, col. 4, lines 30-35. Nowhere does the cited col. 4 anywhere disclose determining one of multiple applications capable of opening the attachment and then using the determined application to convert the attachment. The cited col. 4 only mentions that "a software application" is fed the files to convert, and nowhere discloses the claim requirement of determining one of multiple application programs to convert the attachment file.

The cited col. 8 discusses how a facsimile may be transmitted to a teleconference attendee. Nowhere does the cited col. 8 anywhere disclose or mention the claim requirement of

determining one of multiple application programs to convert the attachment file in different file formats to an image file format.

Accordingly, claims 6, 16, and 26 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 8, 18, and 28 depend from claims 6, 16 and 26 and further require maintaining, with the conversion computer, multiple application programs open to concurrently convert the content of different attachment files to images in the file format. The Examiner cited col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 63 and col. 7, line 7 to col. 8, line 65 as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) Applicant traverses for the following reasons.

As discussed, the cited email processor 139 that converts attachments to fax pages nowhere discloses using multiple applications or maintaining multiple application programs open to concurrently convert the content for different attachments. Instead, the cited email processor 139 just mentions feeding files to a software application to convert. (Szurkowski, col. 5, lines 21-40)

The cited cols. 7 and 8 discusses handling of faxes during a teleconferencing call, and how to transmit facsimiles transmitted as part of a teleconferencing call to attendees of the teleconference. Nowhere do the cited cols. 7 and 8 anywhere disclose that any component, including the email processor 139, maintain multiple application programs open to concurrently convert content for different attachments.

Accordingly, claims 8, 18, and 28 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 9, 19, and 29 depend from claims 8, 18, and 28 and further require that the different attachment files concurrently converted to images in the file format are part of different fax jobs. Because the cited Szurkowski nowhere discloses multiple applications, the cited Szurkowski likewise nowhere discloses the additional requirements of claims 9, 19, and 29 that the concurrently converted attachment files are part of different fax jobs.

Accordingly, claims 9, 19, and 29 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.



Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-30 are patentable over the art of record.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: November 3, 2003

By: 

David W. Victor  
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor  
Konrad Raynes Victor & Mann, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984